

Message

---

**From:** Robert Rutkowski [r\_e\_rutkowski@att.net]  
**Sent:** 4/24/2018 8:58:16 PM  
**To:** Pruitt, Scott [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=757bedfd70ca4219b6d8046f5ce5681e-Pruitt, Sco]  
**Subject:** Scorning Science Once Again

The Honorable Scott Pruitt, Administrator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Headquarters  
William Jefferson Clinton Building  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW; Mail Code 1101A  
Washington, DC 20460  
[pruitt.scott@epa.gov](mailto:pruitt.scott@epa.gov)

Re: Scorning Science Once Again

Dear Administrator Pruitt:

You announced today that the EPA would ignore scientific studies if they don't conform to a set of arbitrary and implausible specifications.

If adopted, this proposed regulation would mean the agency wouldn't consider many peer-reviewed research results when setting important health safeguards.

**Your** disdain for sound science and health protections knows no bounds. Just as you ignore the conclusions of climate scientists, you now want to disregard the robust scientific results that have helped us clean up our air and water since the toxic heyday of the 1970s.

It's time for a new direction at the EPA, one that accepts the simple scientific result that toxic pollutants like mercury and arsenic are dangerous to our own health and that of our children.

This has nothing to do with transparency and everything to do with helping out your industry benefactors.

Stop this arbitrary proposal from being adopted.

## Examples

Medical studies, clinical reports, and real-world field studies all include data and information that cannot be made public without violating confidentiality and patient protection rules under HIPPA. Such studies are used by EPA to provide realistic credible information to the public, including consumers, manufacturers and businesses. For example:

- A landmark study in 1993 established that the tiniest particles of pollution (PM 2.5) can cause heart problems, lung cancer and early death. Industry critics, borrowing an argument they had used to try and prevent regulation of tobacco, decried the research as relying on "secret science." But there is nothing secret about it. In fact, after complaints from members of Congress in the 1990s, an industry-friendly science firm reanalyzed the data of that landmark Harvard Six Cities study and reconfirmed the basic results. Other scientists have also analyzed the same or other data since then and reached the same basic conclusion: Microscopic pollutants are dangerous to our health. If this proposed regulation is adopted, it

would deny EPA the ability to rely upon peer-reviewed studies like the Harvard Six Cities research, which involve commitments to patient confidentiality.

- Scientists reported that the highly toxic pesticide chlorpyrifos impairs brain development and function in children exposed prenatally. The Trump administration is doing the bidding of the agrochemical industry by permitting the use of the pesticide on food crops. The foundational research, published in numerous prestigious scientific journals, is under attack from industry. Pruitt's announcement undercuts EPA technical experts from using this critical evidence of harm to children.

EPA routinely relies upon models such as pollution projection models, economic models, health benefits models and other that inform EPA's rules and regulations. Many of these models including proprietary or confidential components.

Thank you for the opportunity to bring these remarks to your attention.

Yours sincerely,  
Robert E. Rutkowski

cc: House Democratic Whip Office

2527 Faxon Court  
Topeka, Kansas 66605-2086  
P/F: 1 785 379-9671  
E-mail: [r\\_e\\_rutkowski@att.net](mailto:r_e_rutkowski@att.net)